

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usrub.com/

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,955	12/20/2001	Satoru Mayuzumi	NEC 01FN061	4588
7	590 03/09/2004		EXAMINER	
Norman P. Soloway			· IM, JUNGHWA M	
HAYES, SOLO	OWAY, HENNESSEY,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
GROSSMAN & HAGE, P.C.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
175 Canal Street			2811	
Manahastar N	TU 02101			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/036,955	MAYUZUMI, SATORU			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Junghwa M. Im	2811			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty friod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become AB/	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communicatio (NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.		
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	3 February 2004.				
·	·	This action is non-final.				
3)□	, 					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 31,32,34,35,37,38 and 40-43 is/ar 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 31,32,34,35,37,38 and 40-43 is/ar Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	drawn from consideration. re rejected.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to	accepted or b) objected to b				
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co The oath or declaration is objected to by the		•	d).		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage			
Attachmen						
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -			

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 31 and 32 recite "...and said diffusion layer formed on a top surface of said semiconductor substrate." First, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said diffusion layer" in the claims. Second, what is formed on a top surface of the semiconductor surface is a silicide layer (10c) and the diffusion layer (10b) is below the silicide layer as shown in the Figure 4 of the Application. However, Examiner assumes the diffusion barrier recited in pending claims indicates a source and a drain in the substrate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US 5231038), hereinafter Yamaguchi in view of Kim.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 31, insofar as understood, Fig. 1L of Yamaguchi shows a semiconductor device comprising:

a semiconductor substrate (41);

a gate insulating film (48) formed on said semiconductor substrate;

a gate electrode (52) formed on said gate insulating film and having a portion increasing upward in the length along a gate length direction, said gate electrode further having a visor portion;

a side wall (44) formed on a side surface of the gate electrode so as to be covered behind a visor of the gate electrode;

an interlayer insulation film (53) covering the gate electrode; and

a contact (55) formed in interlayer insulation film,

wherein the visor portion has no overhang with respect to the sidewall.

Fig. 1L of Yamaguchi shows substantially an entire claimed structure of the device except a contact being in contact with "a top surface and the side surface of the visor portion, said side wall and said diffusion layer formed on a top surface of said semiconductor surface." Fig. 4C of Kim shows a contact (60b) extending from gate electrode (30b1) to a diffusion layer (a drain/source region; 40b), and continuously contacting the vertical side wall of the gate electrode.

It would have been obvious to include a recited contact in the device of Yamaguchi in order to implement an SRAM cell having this particular circuit connection of gate shorted to drain as discussed at col.4, lines 28-37 of the specification of Kim.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 42, Fig.4C of Kim shows the gate electrode is a gate electrode of one transistor and the diffusion layer is a diffusion layer of a source a drain/source of another transistor. In addition, it is obvious that a configuration for a memory cell transistor has a common source /drain as well known in the art.

Claims 34, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and Kim as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Satoh et al. hereinafter Satoh.

Regarding claim 34, the combined teaching of Yamaguchi and Kim shows substantially the entire claimed structure except "the gate electrode comprises a lower part substantially constant in the length along said gate length direction." Fig. 4D of Satoh shows a gate structure which is identical to the pending claim showing the lower part of the gate is constant in the length along the gate length direction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the shape of the gate of Yamaguchi and Kim with the teaching of Satoh in order to accommodate an obvious design variation of the gate shape as shown Figures 4C-4F of Satoh. Also, note that the lower portion of the gate of Yamaguchi can read *substantially constant*. The reference of Satoh is introduced only to show that a shape of the gate recited in the instant invention is one of various shaped gate known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious matter of design choice since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Regarding claim 37, Fig. 1L of Yamaguchi shows the side wall is formed on both a side surface of the upper part and a side surface of the lower part. It would be also obvious that the sidewalls of the modified gate structure with Satoh's teaching (Fig. 4D) would be formed only below the visor portion to utilize the self-alignment process of the sidewall formation.

Regarding claim 40, Fig. 1L of Yamaguchi shows a side surface of the upper part forms a tapered slope.

Claims 32, 35, 38, 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iguchi et al. hereinafter Iguchi in view of Satoh and Kim.

Regarding claim 32, Fig. 1(a) of Iguchi shows a semiconductor device comprising; a semiconductor substrate (1);

a gate insulating film (17) on said semiconductor substrate;

a gate electrode (19) formed on said gate insulating film and having a portion increasing upward in the length along a gate length direction, said gate electrode further having a visor portion;

a side wall (16; 16a, 15, 3, 2) formed on a side surface of the gate electrode so as to be covered behind a visor of the gate electrode, said side wall (16; 15, 3) being formed of a lamination of at least two different insulation films having different etching properties (col. 13, lines 24-25), each of the insulating films (15, 3) contacts both the interlayer insulating film and the gate electrode (19) and the insulation films contact each other; and

a contact (34) formed in interlayer insulation film (33) in Fig.6(q).

Art Unit: 2811

Iguchi shows most aspect of the instant invention except the visor portion without overhang. Fig. 4D of Satoh shows a gate structure which is identical to the pending claim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the shape of the Iguchi's gate with the teaching of Satoh in order to accommodate an obvious design variation of the gate shape as shown Figures 4C-4F of Satoh. Therefore, it would be also obvious that the sidewalls of the modified Iguchi's gate structure would be formed only below the visor portion to utilize the self-alignment process of the sidewall formation.

The combined teaching of Iguchi and Sato shows substantially an entire claimed structure of the device except a contact being in contact with "a top surface and the side surface of the visor portion, said side wall and said diffusion layer formed on a top surface of said semiconductor surface." Fig. 4C of Kim shows a contact (60b) extending from gate electrode (30b1) to a diffusion layer (a drain/source region; 40b), and continuously contacting the vertical side wall of the gate electrode. It would have been obvious to include a recited contact layer in the device of Iguchi and Satoh in order to implement an SRAM cell having this particular circuit connection of gate shorted to drain as discussed at col.4, lines 28-37 of the specification of Kim.

Regarding claim 35, Fig. 1(a) of Iguchi et al. show the gate electrode comprises a lower part substantially constant in the length along said gate length direction, and an upper part on said lower part increasing upward in the length along said gate length direction.

Regarding claim 38, Fig. 1(a) of Iguchi shows the side wall is formed on both a side surface of the upper part and a side surface of the lower part. It would be also obvious that the sidewalls of the modified Iguchi's gate structure with Satoh's teaching would be formed only below the visor portion to utilize the self-alignment process of the sidewall formation.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 41, Fig. 1(a) of Iguchi shows a side surface of the upper part forms a tapered slope.

Regarding claim 43, Fig.4C of Kim shows the gate electrode is a gate electrode of one transistor and the diffusion layer is a diffusion layer of a source a drain/source of another transistor. In addition, it is obvious that a configuration for a memory cell transistor has a common source /drain as well known in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junghwa M. Im whose telephone number is (571) 272-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-FRI. 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/036,955 Page 8

Art Unit: 2811

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jmi

EDDIE LEE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800